REMARKS

The subject application has been thoroughly reviewed in light of the outstanding Office Action of March 28, 2005. Claims 19, 20, 22-25, 27, 28, 30-33 are pending, with claims 19, 24, 27 and 32 being independent and amended in the present response. Claims 1-18, 21, 26, 29 and 34 were previously canceled without prejudice and/or disclaimer of subject matter. Each of the issues raised in the outstanding Action are addressed below.

§102 Rejection

Claims 19, 20, 22-25, 27, 28 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as reciting subject matter that is allegedly anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,401,080 (Bigus et al.). While not addressing the merits of the Actions' position, Applicants previously amended each of independent claims 19, 24, 27 and 32 with the claim language from canceled dependent claims 21, 26, 29 and 34, respectively. These claims were previously indicated as allowable in the Action of October 19, 2004, if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, it was believed that such an amendment to the independent claims would place the application in condition for allowance.

Nevertheless, since Bigus et al. lacks the feature previously recited in claims 21, 26, 29 and 34, this §102 rejection is considered irrelevant and moot. Withdrawal of this prior art rejection, therefore, is now respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection

Claims 21, 26, 29 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bigus et al. in view of U.S. patent no. 5,872,834 (Teitelbaum). While this rejection is viewed as improper, as the rejected claims were canceled in Applicants February 18, 2005

response, Applicants will address the rejection as if the Examiner had rejected the rewritten independent claims under §103 in view of the noted references.

To ensure that Applicants were interpreting this understanding of the above-noted error correctly, Applicants' below signed representative telephoned the Examiner to discuss the issue and confirm that the Examiner had meant to reject the base independent claims. The Examiner confirmed this understanding.

In addition to the above-noted issue, Applicants' representative discussed the status of the independent claims as amended and the cited prior art. The Examiner agreed that removal of the phrase "common phone number called" from the independent claims would distinguish the claimed invention over the Teitelbaum reference and place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, as set out in the claim listing, the phrase "common phone number called" has been deleted from each of the independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the issues raised in the Office Action of March 28, 2005 have all been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

It is believed that no additional fees, save for the fee for extending the time for response, are due. In the event that it is determined that any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. **50-0311**, Reference No. 22097-007, Customer No. 35437.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 692-6803. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 25, 2005

Richard G. Gervase, Reg. No. 46,725
Brian P. Hopkins, Reg. No. 42,669
Attorneys for Applicants
c/o Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris
Glovsky & Popeo, PC
The Chrysler Center
666 Third Avenue, 24TH Floor
New York, New York 10017
Tel. No.: (212) 935-3000
Fax No.: (212) 983-3115